Mental disorder symptoms during the COVID-19 pandemic in Latin America

- A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Abstract

Objective. There is a lack of evidence related to the prevalence of mental disorder symptoms as well as their heterogeneities during the COVID-19 pandemic in Latin America, a continent across the equators. The current study aims to provide meta-analytical evidence on mental disorder symptoms during COVID-19 among frontline healthcare workers, general healthcare workers, the general population, and university students in Latin America.

Methods. Bibliographical databases, such as *PubMed*, *Embase*, *Web of Sciences*, *PsycINFO*, and *medRxiv*, were systematically searched to identify pertinent studies up to February 6, 2021. Two coders performed the screening using predefined eligibility criteria. Studies were assigned quality scores using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool. The double data extraction method was used to minimize data entry errors.

Results. A total of 33 studies with 101,772 participants in Latin America were identified. The pooled prevalence of anxiety, depression, distress, and insomnia was 32%, 27%, 32%, and 35%, respectively. There was a higher prevalence of mental health symptoms in South America compared to Central America (33% vs. 27%, $p < 0.001$). The pooled prevalence of mental health symptoms in the general population, general healthcare workers, frontline healthcare workers, and students in Latin America was 33%, 31%, 37%, and 36%, respectively.

Conclusion. The high yet heterogenous level of prevalence of mental disorder symptoms emphasizes the need for appropriate identification of psychological interventions in Latin America.

Keywords: Mental health; Prevalence; Healthcare Workers; Anxiety; Depression; Distress, Insomnia.

58

59 **Introduction**

60

61 The continent of Latin America of 34 countries or territories has had the second amount of
 62 cases and deaths per capita for coronavirus disease (COVID-19)(Burki, 2020)(Ríos, 2021;
 63 World Health Organization, 2020). Latin America is vulnerable to the destructive outbreak
 64 for several reasons^{1,4,5} including long-standing structural and socioeconomic inequities(Burki,
 65 2020; Carvalho et al., 2015; Dávila-Cervantes & Agudelo-Botero, 2019), over 20% of the
 66 population in poverty, lack of healthcare access, underfunded healthcare systems, poor
 67 governance or political dynamics, and a high burden of chronic and metabolic health
 68 conditions, and lack of preparedness to fight the pandemic(Malta et al., 2020)⁻⁸. Reportedly,
 69 there is a considerable increase in psychological morbidities among several demographic
 70 groups, including healthcare workers, the general population, and students(Campos et al.,
 71 2021). Latin America is also a vast continent, where tropical regions span across almost all
 72 Latin American countries, and regional disparities on mental health has been reported(Malta
 73 et al., 2020), but we still lack evidence on the prevalence of mental disorder symptoms as
 74 well as their heterogeneities in Latin America during the COVID-19 pandemic.

75

76 Recently, meta-analyses have provided early global evidence on the prevalence of mental
 77 disorder symptoms across groups, including healthcare workers, the general population, and
 78 students(Batra et al., 2021; K Batra et al., 2020; X. Chen et al., 2021; M Luo et al., 2020;
 79 Pappa et al., 2020). These previous reports included very few studies based on Latin
 80 American samples, therefore meta-analytical evidence for Latin America is lacking. With
 81 emerging studies on mental health in Latin America, it is critical to synthesize meta-
 82 analytical evidence to provide integrated data on mental health among key demographic
 83 groups in Latin America during the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, this meta-analysis aims
 84 to investigate the pooled prevalence of mental disorder symptoms during the COVID-19

85 pandemic among frontline healthcare workers, general healthcare workers, the general
86 population, and university students in Latin America. We first perform subgroup analysis
87 breaking Latin America based on South America (a majority but not all countries are in
88 tropical regions) and Central America (all countries are entirely tropical).

89 **Methods**

90 91 Protocol Registration

92 We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
93 (PRISMA) statement 2020 (Liberati et al., 2009) to guide our meta-analysis and registered it
94 with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO:
95 CRD42020224458).

96 97 Eligibility Criteria

98 The search targeted observational studies that assessed the prevalence of psycho-morbid
99 symptoms of anxiety, depression, distress, and insomnia among frontline healthcare workers,
100 general healthcare workers, the general population aged 18 years or above, and university
101 students in Latin America. A priori inclusion criteria were established to identify eligible
102 studies that used established psychometric survey tools, used English language, and were
103 available as full-texts. Studies which targeted other populations, including children,
104 adolescents, and certain subgroups (e.g. pregnant women), were excluded. Other study
105 designs, such as reviews and meta-analyses, qualitative, mixed methods, case reports, studies
106 published only as abstracts, biochemical and experimental studies, or articles lacking the use
107 of psychometric robust instruments or with ambiguous methodology to identify prevalence
108 were also excluded. Studies based on non-Latin American countries were excluded. Studies
109 with unclear methodology and results were reviewed carefully and a researcher (WX) of our
110 study attempted to contact authors to seek the information in several instances: 1) if the study

reported estimates for both targeted and excluded populations, posing challenges for us to delineate the prevalence rate for the population of interest to our study; 2) if the study did not report the prevalence as proportions; 3) if the study did not specify cut-off scores for levels of severity; or 4) if the study was missing crucial information such as response rate, duration of data collection, and gender distribution.

Data Sources and Search Strategy

This meta-analysis is part of a large project on meta-analysis of mental health symptoms during COVID-19. Bibliographic databases, such as PubMed, Embase, PsycINFO, and Web of Sciences, were searched on February 6, 2021. MedRxiv was also searched for preprints. Search algorithms specific to each database were used to yield a comprehensive pool of literature. A detailed search strategy appears in Table S1.

Phases of Screening

A researcher (JC) exported the search results from various databases into Endnote to remove duplicates and then imported them into Rayyan for subsequent screening. Two reviewers (AD & BZC) independently screened the titles and abstracts of all papers in accordance with the prespecified eligibility criteria. The eligible abstracts proceeded to full-text screening for possible inclusion. Any conflicts between reviewers were resolved by a third reviewer (RKD).

Data Extraction

A codebook was developed for standardization and consistency. The final studies included from the screening process were sent to three groups (two reviewers in each group, WX & AY, BZC & AD, RZC & SM) for thorough investigation and extraction of relevant data elements into a coding book. Standardized codes were used to record pertinent variables, including author, title, country, duration of data collection, study design, population, sample

size, response rate, female proportion rate, mean age, psychological outcome, severity level of outcome, type of survey instruments with cut-off scores, and prevalence of psycho-morbid events. The severity of psychological outcomes of interest was coded as above mild, moderate above, and severe levels (if available). The studies that reported only mild, moderate, and severe prevalence data were recoded into mild above, moderate above, and severe prevalence for consistency purposes. The severity levels in studies that only reported the overall prevalence were determined based on cut-off scores (if available). After finishing independent coding, all the extracted data elements were subject to a second round of review by the coders to identify any discrepancies. In case of disagreements, a third reviewer (TL) was asked for the final decision. The third reviewer helped to achieve consensus through re-verification and discussion.

Risk of Bias (RoB) Assessment

The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) with seven questions was used as a quality assessment tool (Hong et al., 2018; Pablo et al., 2020; Usher et al., 2020). Two reviewers independently assessed and assigned scores to the studies using the tool dictionary and guidelines. Disagreements were resolved through discussion with the lead reviewer (RKD). The quality scores ranged from 0 to 7 (highest quality). Studies were categorized as high, medium, or low quality, if they attained the score of 6, 5 to 6, or <5 respectively¹⁸.

Effect Measure and Data Analysis

Using Version 16.1 of Stata (metaprop package), a random effects model was used to compute the pooled estimates (DerSimonian & Laird, 1986). To quantify heterogeneity, I^2 statistics was used and I^2 over 75% was considered substantial (Higgins et al., 2019). Visual inspection of the Doi plot and the Luis Furuya-Kanamori (Furuya-Kanamori et al., 2018)

index were used to assess publication bias(Kounou et al., 2020; Yitayih et al., 2020). Event ratio was used as the primary effect measure for the pooled estimates.

Results

Screening of Studies

A total of 6,949 records were identified through searching bibliographical databases and other sources (Figure 1). After removing 3,603 duplicates, a total of 3,346 records advanced to the phase of screening. After excluding 2,662 records that did not pass the title and abstract screening, only 684 records were identified as eligible for full-text screening. Of the 684 studies, findings of 29 studies were verified through emails with their authors. We received responses for 8 studies, which were included in the final pool. We identified a total of 168 studies of which 135 did not study populations in Latin American countries (Figure 1). Therefore, only 33 studies, focused on populations in Latin America, were used in the final data extraction and analysis.

Study Characteristics

A total of 36 unique samples from 33 studies(Badellino et al., 2020; Campos et al., 2020; Cénat et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2020a; Chen et al., 2020b; Civantos et al., 2020; Cortés-Álvarez et al., 2020; Dal’Bosco et al., 2020; De Boni et al., 2020; Fernández et al., 2020; Feter et al., 2021; Giardino et al., 2020; Goularte et al., 2021; Guiroy et al., 2020; Loret de Mola et al., in press; Malgor et al., 2020; Martinez et al., 2020; Medeiros et al., 2020; Monterrosa-Castro et al., 2020; Mora-Magaña et al., 2020; Paz et al., 2020; Puccinelli et al., 2021; Robles et al., 2020; Samaniego et al., 2020; Schuch et al., 2020; Scotta et al., 2021; Serafim et al., 2021; Torrente et al., 2021; Werneck et al., 2021; Jaime A. Yáñez et al., 2020; Jaime A Yáñez et al., 2020; Stephen X Zhang et al., 2021; Stephen Xu Zhang et al., 2021)

involving 101,772 participants from Latin America were included in this meta-analysis (Table 1). Some studies include multiple independent samples. For example, one study⁴⁷ examined the prevalence of both general healthcare workers and frontline healthcare workers. Among them, 20 samples (55.5%) were of general populations^{3, 6, 8-10, 12, 15, 17-22, 25, 28, 30-32}, 2 samples (5.5%) were of frontline healthcare workers (Dal’Bosco et al., 2020; Robles et al., 2020), 12 samples (33.3%) were from general healthcare workers (Chen et al., 2020a; Chen et al., 2020b; Civantos et al., 2020; Giardino et al., 2020; Guiroy et al., 2020; Malgor et al., 2020; Monterrosa-Castro et al., 2020; Mora-Magaña et al., 2020; Robles et al., 2020; Samaniego et al., 2020; Jaime A. Yáñez et al., 2020; Jaime A Yáñez et al., 2020; Stephen X Zhang et al., 2021), and 2 samples (5.5%) were based on university students (Medeiros et al., 2020; Scotta et al., 2021). Of the 33 studies, 17 were from Brazil (Table 1). Except for two (6.1%) longitudinal cohort studies (Feter et al., 2021; Loret de Mola et al., in press), the majority of the studies were cross-sectional (93.9%). The sample size varied from 57 to 43,995 participants. The participation rates varied from 11.4% to 100.0% with a median value of 66.0%. The female proportions among the 36 samples varied from 3.4% to 100% with a median of 69.8%.

Estimates of Pooled Prevalence of Psychological Morbidity Symptoms

In Latin America, 32 samples from 29 studies (Badellino et al., 2020; Campos et al., 2020; Cénat et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2020b; Civantos et al., 2020; Cortés-Álvarez et al., 2020; Dal’Bosco et al., 2020; De Boni et al., 2020; Fernández et al., 2020; Feter et al., 2021; Giardino et al., 2020; Goularte et al., 2021; Loret de Mola et al., in press; Malgor et al., 2020; Martinez et al., 2020; Medeiros et al., 2020; Monterrosa-Castro et al., 2020; Mora-Magaña et al., 2020; Paz et al., 2020; Puccinelli et al., 2021; Robles et al., 2020; Samaniego et al., 2020; Schuch et al., 2020; Serafim et al., 2021; Torrente et al., 2021; Werneck et al., 2021; Jaime A. Yáñez et al., 2020; Stephen X Zhang et al., 2021; Zhang et al., in press) reported the

213 prevalence of anxiety symptoms among 99,064 participants. Among all the anxiety survey
 214 tools used, the Generalized Anxiety Symptoms 7-items scale (GAD-7) was the most common
 215 (51.7%), followed by the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) (13.8%),
 216 Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale – 21 Items (DASS-21) (10.3%), and Brief Symptom
 217 Inventory 18 (BSI-18) (3.5%). The cut-off values to determine the overall prevalence as well
 218 as the severity of anxiety varied across studies. In the random-effects model, the pooled
 219 prevalence of anxiety was 32% (95% CI: 27%–38%, $I^2 = 99.8\%$) in the 29 studies (Figure
 220 2A). A total of 27 samples from 24 studies(Badellino et al., 2020; Campos et al., 2020;
 221 Civantos et al., 2020; Cortés-Álvarez et al., 2020; Dal’Bosco et al., 2020; De Boni et al.,
 222 2020; Fernández et al., 2020; Feter et al., 2021; Giardino et al., 2020; Goularte et al., 2021;
 223 Guiroy et al., 2020; Loret de Mola et al., in press; Martinez et al., 2020; Medeiros et al., 2020;
 224 Mora-Magaña et al., 2020; Paz et al., 2020; Puccinelli et al., 2021; Robles et al., 2020;
 225 Samaniego et al., 2020; Schuch et al., 2020; Serafim et al., 2021; Torrente et al., 2021;
 226 Stephen X Zhang et al., 2021; Zhang et al., in press) reported the prevalence of depression
 227 among 53,622 respondents. Among all the depression survey tools, the Patient Health
 228 Questionnaire (PHQ)-9 was the most frequently used (45.83%), followed by HADS (16.67%),
 229 DASS-21 (12.5%), and Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) (4.17%). On analysing the random-
 230 effects model, the pooled prevalence of depression was 27% (95% CI: 27%–38%, $I^2 = 99.8\%$)
 231 among the 24 studies (Figure 2B). Eight studies(Chen et al., 2020a; Civantos et al., 2020;
 232 Cortés-Álvarez et al., 2020; Fernández et al., 2020; Reidy, 2020; Samaniego et al., 2020;
 233 Jaime A. Yáñez et al., 2020; Stephen Xu Zhang et al., 2021) studied mental distress among
 234 7,644 participants. In the random-effects model, the pooled prevalence of distress was 32%
 235 (95% CI: 22%–42%, $I^2 = 99.9\%$) (Figure 2C). Seven samples of the five studies(Giardino et
 236 al., 2020; Goularte et al., 2021; Robles et al., 2020; Samaniego et al., 2020; Scotta et al., 2021)
 237 studied insomnia among 11,088 respondents. The Insomnia Severity Index (ISI) was used

most often to measure insomnia followed by DSM. In the random-effects model, the pooled prevalence of insomnia was 35% (95% CI: 24%–48%, $I^2 = 99.6\%$) (Figure 2D).

The overall prevalence of mental health symptoms in frontline healthcare workers, general healthcare workers, the general population, and students in Latin America was 37%, 31%, 33%, and 36%, respectively. The overall prevalence rates of mental health symptoms that exceeded the cut-off values of mild, moderate, and severe symptoms were 53%, 28%, and 10%, respectively (Table 2). The pooled prevalence rates of mental health symptoms in South America, Central America, countries speaking Spanish, and countries speaking Portuguese were 33%, 27%, 30%, and 36%, respectively (Table 2).

Quality of the Studies

Of all studies, 13 studies (39.4%) were of high quality (score of 7), and 20 studies (60.6%) were of medium quality¹⁸ (Table 1). There were no studies of low quality. The subgroup analysis suggests the studies with high quality reported lower prevalence of mental health issues in Latin America (Table 2).

Detection of Publication Bias

The Doi plot and Luis Furuya–Kanamori index were used to quantify publication bias rather than the funnel plot and Egger’s statistics (Furuya-Kanamori et al., 2018; Kounou et al., 2020). The symmetrical, hill-shaped Doi plot and a Luis Furuya–Kanamori (LFK) index of -0.81 indicated ‘no asymmetry’ and a lower likelihood of publication bias (Figure 3).

Discussion

The analysis of 33 studies with 101,772 participants from Latin America generated pooled prevalence of anxiety, depression, distress, and insomnia of 32%, 27%, 32%, and 35% respectively. Notably, this meta-analysis is the first to investigate the prevalence of mental

health symptoms during the COVID-19 crisis in Latin America. The anxiety levels in Latin America were significantly higher than other regions, such as China (25%; $p < 0.001$) (Ren et al., 2020) and Spain (20%; $p < 0.001$) (R. Z. Chen et al., 2021). Latin America has a long-standing history of scarce resources to deal with mental health issues (Alarcón, 2003), which could explain the higher prevalence of mental health symptoms among Latin Americans as revealed by this meta-analysis. Notably, the pooled prevalence of mental health symptoms was lower in Latin America than in Africa and South Asia, as reported by other meta-analyses (J. Chen et al., 2021; Hossain et al., 2020). These cross-region differences may be due to multiple reasons, including heterogeneity in population sizes, variations in and the timing of containment strategies adopted by countries across regions (A. Middelburg & R. Rosendaal, 2020), and the varying degrees of resources available to address mental health issues (Kavita Batra et al., 2020).

The prevalence of mental health symptoms was higher in South America than Central America (33% vs. 27%; $p < 0.001$). This difference might be attributed to variations across these countries in the evolution of the pandemic, the stringency of the COVID-19 responses, and the political climate (Garcia et al., 2020). Previous research noted that South America generally has a high degree of political polarization, which resulted in conflicting information being conveyed to the public which could increase the burden of COVID-19 and its associated psychological corollaries (Garcia et al., 2020). In addition, public health actions or decisions were made mostly at municipal and state levels rather than at central government level, and the lack of central coordination posed several challenges in the control of the pandemic contributing to an increased psychological burden (Garcia et al., 2020).

Based on the evidence of individual studies, our study found a higher prevalence of mental health symptoms among frontline healthcare workers (37%, $p < 0.001$) and university students (36%, $p > 0.001$) than the general population and second-line responders (Batra et al., 2021;

Kavita Batra et al., 2020; Min Luo et al., 2020; Pappa et al., 2020). The vulnerabilities of frontline healthcare workers are often attributed to higher risk of infection, burnout, fear of COVID-19 transmission to their family members, and job loss(Bhandari et al., 2021; Xiang et al., 2020). The greater prevalence of mental health symptoms among the university students can be explained by the uncertainties surrounding the course of the pandemic and the sudden transition to online education(Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020; Batra et al., 2021). Moreover, many businesses scaled down their recruitment efforts leaving limited employment for students and more competition in the graduate labour market(Reidy, 2020). These challenges added to the mental health burden among university students.

Study Limitations

There are a few limitations that merit discussion. First our analysis reveals substantial heterogeneities across studies in the type of survey instruments used and the cut-off scores, both of which may affect the interpretation of the findings. Second, not all Latin American countries have been well-studied, therefore our results may have limited generalizability for the less studied nations. Third, a majority of the included studies were cross-sectional, which provides no information on the prevalence over time during the pandemic. In addition, studies included in this meta-analysis relied on self-reported data of psychological symptoms by the participants and hence do not constitute mental health diagnosis from clinicians. Fourth, other outcomes, such as Post-traumatic Stress Syndrome (PTSD), suicidal ideation, and burnout, were not studied in this meta-analysis, leaving opportunities for prospective studies. Last, a language bias is expected in the study because of the language restriction (only English) applied in this study.

Practical Implications

First, our systematic review and meta-analysis supports evidence-based medicine by revealing a high proportion of mental health symptoms among the general population and

healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in Latin America. However, our systematic review also reveals there is a lack of evidence in many Latin American countries to guide relevant practice of evidence-based medicine on this topic. Only 9 of the 33 Latin American countries have been studied, leaving 24 countries without any studies to assist the practice of evidence-based healthcare. For instance, no relevant research has been done in Venezuela, the fifth biggest South American country with a population of 28 million, in Chile, the six biggest South American country with a population of 18 million, nor in Guatemala (18 million population), Cuba (11 million population) and Dominican Republic (11 million population), respectively the second, fourth, and fifth most populous countries in Central America. In practice, healthcare organizations in those unstudied countries may use our results in the same region as approximate evidence before direct evidence in those countries emerges.

Our findings that the prevalence of mental health symptoms was higher in South America than Central America (33% vs. 27%; $p < 0.001$) provide evidence to international healthcare organizations, such as the World Psychiatric Association, on their assistance and resource allocation efforts. Our findings of a higher prevalence of mental health symptoms among frontline healthcare workers (37%, $p < 0.001$) and university students (36%, $p > 0.001$) than the general population and general healthcare workers suggest psychiatric and healthcare organizations should prioritize frontline healthcare workers and university students in Latin America.

Conclusions

This meta-analysis, to our knowledge, provides the first pooled estimates of mental health symptoms among key demographic groups during the COVID-19 crisis in Latin America. The meta-analytical findings of this study underscore the high prevalence of mental health

342 symptoms in Latin Americans during the COVID-19 crisis. Hence, we call for more research
343 to identify people vulnerable to mental health issues to enable evidence-based medicine
344 during the pandemic.

345

346 References

- 347 A.Middelburg, R., & R.Rosendaal, F. (2020). COVID-19: How to make between-country
348 comparisons. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 96, 477-481.
349 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.066>
- 350 Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2020). COVID-19 pandemic and online learning: The
351 challenges and opportunities. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-13.
352 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180>
- 353 Alarcón, R. D. (2003). Mental health and mental health care in Latin America. *World*
354 *Psychiatry*, 2(1), 54-56.
- 355 Badellino, H., Gobbo, M. E., Torres, E., & Aschieri, M. E. (2020). Early indicators and risk
356 factors associated with mental health problems during COVID-19 quarantine: Is there
357 a relationship with the number of confirmed cases and deaths? *The International*
358 *Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764020966020>
- 359 Batra, K., Sharma, M., Batra, R., Singh, T. P., & Schvaneveldt, N. (2021). Assessing the
360 Psychological Impact of COVID-19 among College Students: An Evidence of 15
361 Countries. *Healthcare (Basel)*, 9(2).
362 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9020222>
- 363 Batra, K., Singh, T., Sharma, M., Batra, R., & Schvaneveldt, N. (2020). Investigating the
364 Psychological Impact of COVID-19 among Healthcare Workers: A Meta-Analysis.
365 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(23).
366 <https://doi.org/doi:10.3390/ijerph17239096>
- 367 Batra, K., Singh, T. P., Sharma, M., Batra, R., & Schvaneveldt, N. (2020). Investigating the
368 Psychological Impact of COVID-19 among Healthcare Workers: A Meta-Analysis.
369 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(23).
370 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17239096>
- 371 Bhandari, N., Batra, K., Upadhyay, S., & Cochran, C. (2021). Impact of COVID-19 on
372 Healthcare Labor Market in the United States: Lower Paid Workers Experienced
373 Higher Vulnerability and Slower Recovery. *International Journal of Environmental*
374 *Research and Public Health*, 18(8). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18083894>
- 375 Burki, T. (2020). COVID-19 in Latin America. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 5, 547-548.
376 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30303-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30303-0)
- 377 Campos, J. A. D. B., Martins, B. G., Campos, L. A., Marôco, J., Saadiq, R. A., & Ruano, R.
378 (2020). Early Psychological Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic in Brazil: A National
379 Survey. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 9(9), 2976. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm9092976>
- 380 Campos, J. A. D. B., Martins, B. G., Campos, L. A., Valadão-Dias, F. d. F., & Marôco, J.
381 (2021). Symptoms related to mental disorder in healthcare workers during the
382 COVID-19 pandemic in Brazil. *International Archives of Occupational and*
383 *Environmental Health*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-021-01656-4>
- 384 Carvalho, R. A., Santos, V. S., Melo, C. M., Gurgel, R. Q., & Oliveira, C. C. (2015).
385 Inequalities in health: living conditions and infant mortality in Northeastern Brazil.
386 *Revista de saude publica*, 49(5). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1590/s0034-8910.2015049004794>
- 387
- 388 Cénat, J. M., Dalexis, R. D., Guerrier, M., Noorishad, P.-G., Derivois, D., Bukaka, J.,
389 Birangui, J.-P., Adansikou, K., Clorméus, L. A., & Kokou-Kpolou, C. K. (2021).
390 Frequency and correlates of anxiety symptoms during the COVID-19 pandemic in
391 low-and middle-income countries: A multinational study. *Journal of Psychiatric*
392 *Research*, 132, 13-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.09.031>
- 393 Chen, J., Farah, N., Dong, R. K., Chen, R. Z., Xu, W., Yin, A., Chen, B. Z., Delios, A.,
394 Miller, S., Wan, X., & Zhang, S. X. (2021). The Mental Health Under the COVID-19

- Crisis in Africa: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *medRxiv*.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.19.21255755>
- Chen, R. Z., Zhang, S. X., Xu, W., Yin, A., Dong, R. K., Chen, B. Z., Delios, A., McIntyre, R. S., Miller, S., & Wan, X. (2021). Meta-Analysis on Mental health disorders in Spain in the COVID-19 Crisis. *medRxiv*.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.11.21255274>
- Chen, X., Chen, J., Zhang, M., Chen, R. Z., Dong, R. K., Dong, Z., Ye, Y., Tong, L., Chen, B. Z., Zhao, R., Wenrui Cao, P. L., & Zhang, S. X. (2021). One Year of Evidence on Mental Health in the COVID-19 Crisis-A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *medRxiv*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.01.21250929>
- Chen, X., Zhang, S. X., Jahanshahi, A. A., Alvarez-Risco, A., Dai, H., Li, J., & Ibarra, V. G. (2020a). Belief in a COVID-19 conspiracy theory as a predictor of mental health and well-being of health care workers in Ecuador: cross-sectional survey study. *JMIR Public Health Surveillance*, 6(3), e20737. <https://doi.org/10.2196/20737>
- Chen, X., Zhang, S. X., Jahanshahi, A. A., Alvarez-Risco, A., Dai, H., Li, J., & Ibarra, V. G. (2020b). Belief in Conspiracy Theory about COVID-19 Predicts Mental Health and Well-being – A Study of Healthcare Staff in Ecuador. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance*, 6(3), e20737. <https://doi.org/10.2196/20737>
- Civantos, A. M., Bertelli, A., Gonçalves, A., Getzen, E., Chang, C., Long, Q., & Rajasekaran, K. J. A. j. o. o. (2020). Mental health among head and neck surgeons in Brazil during the COVID-19 pandemic: A national study. 41(6), 102694.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjoto.2020.102694>
- Cortés-Álvarez, N. Y., Pineiro-Lamas, R., & Vuelvas-Olmos, C. R. (2020). Psychological effects and associated factors of COVID-19 in a Mexican sample. *Journal Disaster medicine public health preparedness*, 14(3), 413-424.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2020.215>
- Dal’Bosco, E. B., Floriano, L. S. M., Skupien, S. V., Arcaro, G., Martins, A. R., & Anselmo, A. C. C. (2020). Mental health of nursing in coping with COVID-19 at a regional university hospital. *Journal Revista brasileira de enfermagem*, 73.
<https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7167-2020-0434>
- Dávila-Cervantes, C. A., & Agudelo-Botero, M. (2019). Health inequalities in Latin America: Persistent gaps in life expectancy. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 3(12), 492-493.
[https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/s2542-5196\(19\)30244-x](https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/s2542-5196(19)30244-x)
- De Boni, R. B., Balanzá-Martínez, V., Mota, J. C., Cardoso, T. D. A., Ballester, P., Atienza-Carbonell, B., Bastos, F. I., & Kapczinski, F. (2020). Depression, Anxiety, and Lifestyle Among Essential Workers: A Web Survey From Brazil and Spain During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 22(10), e22835.
<https://doi.org/10.2196/22835>
- DerSimonian, R., & Laird, N. (1986). Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled Clinical Trials*, 7(3), 177–188. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0197-2456\(86\)90046-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2)
- Fernández, R. S., Crivelli, L., Guimet, N. M., Allegri, R. F., & Pedreira, M. E. (2020). Psychological distress associated with COVID-19 quarantine: Latent profile analysis, outcome prediction and mediation analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 277, 75-84. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.07.134>
- Feter, N., Caputo, E., Doring, I., Leite, J., Cassuriaga, J., Reichert, F., da Silva, M., Coombes, J., & Rombaldi, A. (2021). Sharp increase in depression and anxiety among Brazilian adults during the COVID-19 pandemic: findings from the PAMPA cohort. *Public health*, 190, 101-107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.11.013>
- Furuya-Kanamori, L., Barendregt, J. J., & Doi, S. A. R. (2018). A new improved graphical and quantitative method for detecting bias in meta-analysis. *International Journal of*

- Evidence-Based Healthcare, 16(4), 195-203.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000141>
- Garcia, P. J., Alarcón, A., Bayer, A., Buss, P., Guerra, G., Ribeiro, H., Rojas, K., Saenz, R., Snyder, N. S. d., Solimano, G., Torres, R., Tobar, S., Tuesca, R., Vargas, G., & Atun, R. (2020). COVID-19 Response in Latin America. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 103(5), 1765-1772.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.20-0765>
- Giardino, D. L., Huck-Iriart, C., Riddick, M., & Garay, A. (2020). The endless quarantine: The impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on healthcare workers after three months of mandatory social isolation in Argentina. *Sleep medicine*, 76, 16-25.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sleep.2020.09.022>
- Goularte, J. F., Serafim, S. D., Colombo, R., Hogg, B., Caldieraro, M. A., & Rosa, A. R. (2021). COVID-19 and mental health in Brazil: Psychiatric symptoms in the general population. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 132, 32-37.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.09.021>
- Guiroy, A., Gagliardi, M., Coombes, N., Landriel, F., Zanardi, C., Camino Willhuber, G., Guyot, J. P., & Valacco, M. (2020). COVID-19 impact among spine surgeons in Latin America. *Global spine journal*, 2192568220928032.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2192568220928032>
- Higgins, J. P. T., Thomas, J., Chandler, J., Cumpston, M., Li, T., Page, M. J., & Welch, V. A. (2019). Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. *John Wiley & Sons*.
- Hong, Q. N., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., Gagnon, M.-P., Griffiths, F., Nicolau, B., O'Cathain, A., Rousseau, M.-C., Vedel, I., & Pluye, P. (2018). The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. *Education for Information*, 34(4), 285-291.
<https://doi.org/doi:10.3233/EFI-180221>
- Hossain, M., Purohit, N., Sultan, A., Ma, P., Lisako, E., McKyer, J., & Ahmed, H. U. (2020). Prevalence of mental disorders in South Asia: An umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 51.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102041>
- Kounou, K. B., Guédénou, K. M., Foli, A. A. D., & Gnassounou-Akpa, E. (2020). Mental health of medical professionals during the covid-19 pandemic in Togo. *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 74(10), 559-560. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pcn.13108>
- Liberati, A., Altman, D. G., Tetzlaff, J., Mulrow, C., Gøtzsche, P. C., Ioannidis, J. P. A., Clarke, M., Devereaux, P. J., Kleijnen, J., & Moher, D. (2009). The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: Explanation and elaboration. *BMJ*, 339. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1136/bmj.b2700>
- Loret de Mola, C., Blumenberg, C., Martins, R. C., Martins-Silva, T., Carpena, M. X., Del-Ponte, B., Pearson, R., Soares, A. L., & Cesar, J. A. (in press). Increased depression and anxiety during the COVID-19 pandemic in Brazilian mothers: a longitudinal study. *Brazilian Journal of Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1516-4446-2020-1628>
- Luo, M., Guo, L., Yu, M., Jiang, W., & Wang, H. (2020). The psychological and mental impact of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID19) on medical staff and general public - A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychiatry Research*, 291(113190).
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113190>
- Luo, M., Guo, L., Yu, M., Jiang, W., & Wang, H. (2020). The psychological and mental impact of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) on medical staff and general public -

- 494 A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychiatry Research*, 291. [https://doi.org/doi:](https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113190)
495 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113190
- 496 Malgor, R. D., Sobreira, M. L., Mouawad, N. J., Johnson, A. P., Wohlaer, M. V., Coogan, S.
497 M., Cuff, R. F., Coleman, D. M., Sheahan III, M. G., & Woo, K. (2020). Brazilian
498 vascular surgeons experience during the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic.
499 *Vascular*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1708538120954961>
- 500 Malta, M., Murray, L., Da Silva, C. M., & Strathdee, S. A. (2020). Coronavirus in Brazil:
501 The heavy weight of inequality and unsound leadership. *EClinicalMedicine*, 25.
502 <https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.eclim.2020.100472>
- 503 Martinez, E. Z., Silva, F. M., Morigi, T. Z., Zucoloto, M. L., Silva, T. L., Joaquim, A. G.,
504 Dall'Agnol, G., Galdino, G., Martinez, M. O. Z., & Silva, W. R. d. (2020). Physical
505 activity in periods of social distancing due to COVID-19: a cross-sectional survey.
506 *Ciência Saúde Coletiva*, 25, 4157-4168. [https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-](https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-812320202510.2.27242020)
507 [812320202510.2.27242020](https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-812320202510.2.27242020)
- 508 Medeiros, R. A. D., Vieira, D. L., Silva, E. V. F. D., Rezende, L. V. M. D. L., Santos, R. W.
509 D., & Tabata, L. F. (2020). Prevalence of symptoms of temporomandibular disorders,
510 oral behaviors, anxiety, and depression in Dentistry students during the period of
511 social isolation due to COVID-19. *Journal of Applied Oral Science*, 28.
512 <https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-7757-2020-0445>
- 513 Monterrosa-Castro, A., Redondo-Mendoza, V., & Mercado-Lara, M. (2020). Psychosocial
514 factors associated with symptoms of generalized anxiety disorder in general
515 practitioners during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Investigative Medicine*,
516 68(7), 1228-1234. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jim-2020-001456>
- 517 Mora-Magaña, I., Lee, S. A., Maldonado-Castellanos, I., Jiménez-Gutierrez, C., Mendez-
518 Venegas, J., Maya-Del-Moral, A., Rosas-Munive, M. D., Mathis, A. A., & Jobe, M. C.
519 (2020). Coronaphobia among healthcare professionals in Mexico: A psychometric
520 analysis. *Death Studies*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481187.2020.1808762>
- 521 Pablo, G. S. d., Vaquerizo-Serrano, J., Catalan, A., Arango, C., Moreno, C., Ferre, F., Shin, J.
522 I., Sullivan, S., Brondino, N., Solmi, M., & Fusar-Poli, P. (2020). Impact of
523 coronavirus syndromes on physical and mental health of health care workers:
524 Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders*.
525 <https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.jad.2020.06.022>
- 526 Pappa, S., Ntella, V., Giannakas, T., Giannakoulis, V. G., Papoutsis, E., & Katsaounou, P.
527 (2020). Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers
528 during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain*,
529 *Behavior, and Immunity*, 88, 901-907.
530 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.026>
- 531 Paz, C., Mascialino, G., Adana-Díaz, L., Rodríguez-Lorenzana, A., Simbaña-Rivera, K.,
532 Gómez-Barreno, L., Troya, M., Páez, M. I., Cardenas, J., & Gerstner, R. M. (2020).
533 Anxiety and depression in patients with confirmed and suspected COVID-19 in
534 Ecuador. *Psychiatr Clinical Neurosciences*, 74(10), 554-555.
535 <https://doi.org/10.1111/pcn.13106>
- 536 Puccinelli, P. J., Costa, T. S., Seffrin, A., de Lira, C. A., Vancini, R. L., Knechtel, B.,
537 Nikolaidis, P. T., & Andrade, M. S. (2021). Physical Activity Levels and Mental
538 Health during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Preliminary Results of a Comparative Study
539 between Convenience Samples from Brazil and Switzerland. *Medicina*, 57(1), 48.
540 <https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina57010048>
- 541 Reidy, T. (2020, 10 Apr 2020). Recruitment is on hold: the students graduating into the
542 COVID-19 recession. *The Guardian*.

- 543 [https://www.theguardian.com/education/2020/apr/10/recruitment-is-on-hold-the-](https://www.theguardian.com/education/2020/apr/10/recruitment-is-on-hold-the-students-graduating-into-the-covid-19-recession)
- 544 [students-graduating-into-the-covid-19-recession](https://www.theguardian.com/education/2020/apr/10/recruitment-is-on-hold-the-students-graduating-into-the-covid-19-recession)
- 545 Ren, X., Huang, W., Pan, H., Huang, T., Wang, X., & Ma, Y. (2020). Mental Health During
- 546 the Covid-19 Outbreak in China: a Meta-Analysis. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, 91, 1033-
- 547 1045. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11126-020-09796-5>
- 548 Ríos, A. M. (2021, 2020, October 29). *Latin America: COVID-19 cases by country*.
- 549 [https://www.statista.com/statistics/1101643/latin-america-caribbean-coronavirus-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1101643/latin-america-caribbean-coronavirus-cases/)
- 550 [cases/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1101643/latin-america-caribbean-coronavirus-cases/)
- 551 Robles, R., Rodríguez, E., Vega-Ramírez, H., Álvarez-Icaza, D., Madrigal, E., Durand, S.,
- 552 Morales-Chainé, S., Astudillo, C., Real-Ramírez, J., & Medina-Mora, M.-E. (2020).
- 553 Mental health problems among healthcare workers involved with the COVID-19
- 554 outbreak. *Brazilian Journal of Psychiatry*. [https://doi.org/10.1590/1516-4446-2020-](https://doi.org/10.1590/1516-4446-2020-1346)
- 555 [1346](https://doi.org/10.1590/1516-4446-2020-1346)
- 556 Samaniego, A., Urzúa, A., Buenahora, M., & Vera-Villarroel, P. (2020). Sintomatología
- 557 asociada a trastornos de salud mental en trabajadores sanitarios en Paraguay: efecto
- 558 COVID-19. *Revista Interamericana de Psicología/Interamerican Journal of*
- 559 *Psychology*, 54(1), e1298-e1298. <https://doi.org/10.30849/ripijp.v54i1.1298>
- 560 Schuch, F. B., Bulzing, R. A., Meyer, J., Vancampfort, D., Firth, J., Stubbs, B., Grabovac, I.,
- 561 Willeit, P., Tavares, V. D. O., & Calegari, V. C. (2020). Associations of moderate to
- 562 vigorous physical activity and sedentary behavior with depressive and anxiety
- 563 symptoms in self-isolating people during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional
- 564 survey in Brazil. *Psychiatry Research*, 292, 113339.
- 565 <https://doi.org/https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32745795>
- 566 Scotta, A. V., Cortez, M. V., & Miranda, A. R. (2021). Insomnia is associated with worry,
- 567 cognitive avoidance and low academic engagement in Argentinian university students
- 568 during the COVID-19 social isolation. *Psychology Health Medicine*, 1-16.
- 569 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2020.1869796>
- 570 Serafim, A. P., Durães, R. S., Rocca, C. C., Gonçalves, P. D., Saffi, F., Cappelozza, A.,
- 571 Paulino, M., Dumas-Diniz, R., Brissos, S., & Brites, R. (2021). Exploratory study on
- 572 the psychological impact of COVID-19 on the general Brazilian population. *Plos one*,
- 573 16(2), e0245868. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245868>
- 574 Torrente, F., Yoris, A., Low, D., Lopez, P., Bekinschtein, P., Manes, F., & Cetkovich, M.
- 575 (2021). Sooner than you think: A very early affective reaction to the COVID-19
- 576 pandemic and quarantine in Argentina. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 282, 495-503.
- 577 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.12.124>
- 578 Usher, K., Jackson, D., Durkin, J., Gyamfi, N., & Bhullar, N. (2020). Pandemic-related
- 579 behaviours and psychological outcomes; A rapid literature review to explain COVID-
- 580 19 behaviours. *Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 29(6), 1018–1034.
- 581 <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1111/inm.12790>
- 582 Werneck, A. O., Silva, D. R., Malta, D. C., Souza-Júnior, P. R., Azevedo, L. O., Barros, M.
- 583 B., & Szwarcwald, C. L. (2021). Physical inactivity and elevated TV-viewing
- 584 reported changes during the COVID-19 pandemic are associated with mental health:
- 585 A survey with 43,995 Brazilian adults. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 140,
- 586 110292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2020.110292>
- 587 World Health Organization. (2020). *Global health estimates: Leading causes of death*. (n.d.).
- 588 Retrieved from [https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/mortality-and-global-](https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/mortality-and-global-health-estimates/ghe-leading-causes-of-death)
- 589 [health-estimates/ghe-leading-causes-of-death](https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/mortality-and-global-health-estimates/ghe-leading-causes-of-death).
- 590 [https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/mortality-and-global-health-estimates/ghe-](https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/mortality-and-global-health-estimates/ghe-leading-causes-of-death)
- 591 [leading-causes-of-death](https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/mortality-and-global-health-estimates/ghe-leading-causes-of-death)

- Xiang, Y.-T., Yang, Y., Li, W., Zhang, L., Zhang, Q., Cheung, T., & Ng, C. H. (2020). Timely mental health care for the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak is urgently needed. *Lancet Psychiatry*, 7(3), 228-229.
- Yáñez, J. A., Jahanshahi, A. A., Alvarez-Risco, A., Li, J., & Zhang, S. X. (2020). Anxiety, Distress, and Turnover Intention of Healthcare Workers in Peru by Their Distance to the Epicenter during the COVID-19 Crisis. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 103(4), 1614 - 1620. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.20-0800>
- Yáñez, J. A., Jahanshahi, A. A., Alvarez-Risco, A., Li, J., Zhang, S. X. J. T. A. J. o. T. M., & Hygiene. (2020). Anxiety, distress, and turnover intention of healthcare workers in Peru by their distance to the epicenter during the COVID-19 crisis. *103*(4), 1614-1620. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.20-0800>
- Yitayih, Y., Mekonen, S., Zeynudin, A., Mengistie, E., & Ambelu, A. (2020). Mental health of healthcare professionals during the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic in Ethiopia. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjo.2020.130>
- Zhang, S. X., Chen, J., Jahanshahi, A. A., Alvarez-Risco, A., Dai, H., Li, J., & Patty-Tito, R. M. (2021). Succumbing to the COVID-19 pandemic—Healthcare workers not satisfied and intend to leave their jobs. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00418-6>
- Zhang, S. X., Huang, H., Li, J., Antonelli-Ponti, M., Paiva, S. F. d., & Silva, J. A. d. (in press). Predictors of Depression and Anxiety Symptoms in Brazil during COVID-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*.
- Zhang, S. X., Wang, Y., Jahanshahi, A. A., Li, J., & Schmitt, V. G. H. J. J. o. P. R. (2021). Early evidence and predictors of mental distress of adults one month in the COVID-19 epidemic in Brazil. *142*, 110366. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2021.110366>

Table 1. Characteristics of the studies on mental health in Latin America during the COVID-19 pandemic

Characteristics	Total number of studies/samples*	Percent	Level of analysis
Overall	33/36	100	
Outcome #			Prevalence
Anxiety	56	41.48	
Depression	49	36.3	
Distress	14	10.37	
Insomnia	16	11.85	
Severity#			Prevalence
Above mild	52	38.52	
Above moderate	45	33.33	
Above severe	30	22.22	
Overall	8	5.93	
Population			Sample
Frontline healthcare workers	2	5.56	
General healthcare workers	12	33.33	
General population	20	55.56	
Students	2	5.56	
Sampling Country			Sample
Argentina	5	13.89	
Bolivia	1	2.78	
Brazil	17	47.22	
Colombia	1	2.78	
Ecuador	2	5.56	
Haiti	1	2.78	
Mexico	5	13.89	
Paraguay	1	2.78	
Peru	2	5.56	
Mixed	1	2.78	
Quality			Study
High	13	39.4	
Medium	20	60.6	
Design			Study
Cohort	2	6.06	
Cross-sectional	31	93.94	
Publication			Study
Preprint	2	6.06	
Published	31	93.94	
Overall	Mean (median)	Range	
Number of participants	2827 (615)	57 – 43,995	Sample
Female proportion	65.1% (69.8%)	3.4% – 100%	Sample
Response rate	63.3% (66.0%)	11.4% – 100%	Sample

*Some studies include multiple independent samples. For example, one study⁴⁷ examined the prevalence of both general healthcare workers and frontline healthcare workers.

#One independent sample in a study may report anxiety, depression, and insomnia at the levels of mild above, moderate above, and severe. Therefore, the total number of prevalence is larger than the total number of independent samples.

Table 2. Pooled prevalence estimates of mental health symptoms by outcome, population, severity and region subgroups during the COVID-19 pandemic

First-level subgroup	Second-level subgroup	Prevalence (%)	95% CI (%)	I ² (%)	P value
Aggregated		32	29 – 36	99.8	0.00
Outcome	Anxiety	32	27 – 38	99.8	0.00
	Depression	32	27 – 38	99.8	0.00
	Distress	32	22 – 42	98.9	0.00
	Insomnia	35	24 – 48	99.6	0.00
Population	Frontline HCWs	37	24 – 51	98.6	0.00
	General HCWs	31	25 – 37	98.6	0.00
	General population	33	28 – 38	99.4	0.00
	Students	36	10 – 68	99.5	0.00
Severity	Above mild	53	48 – 57	99.3	0.00
	Above moderate	28	25 – 32	99.2	0.00
	Above severe	10	7 – 13	95.3	0.00
	Overall	32	22 – 42	99.4	0.00
Region	South America	33	29 – 37	99.8	0.00
	Central America	27	21 – 34	99.2	0.00
	Countries speaking Spanish	30	26 – 34	99.7	0.00
	Countries speaking Portuguese	36	30 – 41	99.8	0.00
Quality	Studies with high quality	38	17 – 61	99.4	0.00
	Studies with medium quality	32	29 – 36	99.7	0.00

Note: CI = Confidence Interval; I² statistic indicates heterogeneity

Figure 1: PRISMA diagram detailing the screening process

Figure 2A. Forest plot indicating the pooled prevalence of anxiety among included studies

Figure legend: The square markers indicate the prevalence of anxiety symptoms among population groups of interest. The diamonds represent the pooled estimates.

Figure 2B. Forest plot indicating the pooled prevalence of depression among included studies

Figure legend: The square markers indicate the prevalence of depression symptoms among population groups of interest. The diamond represents the pooled estimates.

NA = Not applicable, when study location was not specified.

Figure 2C. Forest plot indicating the pooled prevalence of distress among included studies

Figure legend: The square markers indicate the prevalence of distress symptoms among population groups of interest. The diamond represents the pooled estimates.

Figure 2D. Forest plot indicating the pooled prevalence of insomnia among included studies

Figure legend: The square markers indicate the prevalence of insomnia symptoms among population groups of interest. The diamond represents the pooled estimates.

Figure 3. The DOI plot and the Luis Furuya-Kanamori (LFK) index for publication bias
 Note ES = Effect size

Supplementary materials

Table S1: Search strategy of this systematic review and meta-analysis

Search query	Search topic	Search keywords (titles, abstracts, and subject headings) with Boolean operators
1	Exposure/ Context	“Coronavirus” OR “COVID-19” OR “SARS-CoV-2” OR “2019-nCoV”
2	Outcome of interest	“depression” OR “depressive symptoms” OR “depressive disorder*” OR “anxiety” OR “social anxiety” or “social phobia” OR “anxiety disorder*” OR “insomnia” OR “sleep disorder” OR “depressive disorder*” OR “distress”
3	Epidemiological phenomenon	“prevalence” OR “incidence” OR “rate*” OR “ratio*” OR “epidemiology*” OR “risk factor*” OR “relative risk” OR “odds ratio” OR “risk ratio” OR “disease burden”
4	Language	English
5	Time	2020.2.1 – 2021.2.6
	Intersection of four topics	1 AND 2 AND 3 AND 4 AND 5

Table S2: Subgroup analyses of the prevalence of anxiety, depression, and insomnia symptoms

Groups	Subgroups	Anxiety	Depression	Distress	Insomnia
Number of studies		29	24	8	5
Number of samples		32	27	8	7
Number of prevalence		56	49	14	16
Number of participants		99,064	53,622	7,664	11,088
Aggregated		32%, 95% CI: 27% – 38%, I ² : 99.8%	32%, 95% CI: 27% – 38%, I ² : 99.8%	32%, 95% CI: 22% – 42%, I ² : 99.9%	35%, 95% CI: 24% – 48%, I ² : 99.6%
Population	Frontline HCWs	23%, 95% CI: 21% – 26%, 30%, 95% CI: 20% – 41%, I ² : 99.2%	37%, 95% CI: 34% – 39%, 31%, 95% CI: 19% – 44%, I ² : 99.2%	NA 30%, 95% CI: 19% – 43%, I ² : 95.9%	NA 34%, 95% CI: 19% – 49%, I ² : 99.7%
	General HCWs	33%, 95% CI: 26% – 40%, I ² : 99.9%	33%, 95% CI: 26% – 39%, I ² : 99.8%	33%, 95% CI: 19% – 50%, I ² : 99.5%	NA
	General population	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Students	NA	NA	NA	NA
Severity	Above mild	53%, 95% CI: 44% – 62%, I ² : 99.7%	48%, 95% CI: 41% – 56%, I ² : 99.6%	56%, 95% CI: 38% – 74%, I ² : 97.9%	60%, 95% CI: 50% – 69%, I ² : 99.1%
	Above moderate	28%, 95% CI: 25% – 32%, I ² : 98.2%	28%, 95% CI: 21% – 36%, I ² : 99.6%	28%, 95% CI: 22% – 33%, I ² : 99.6%	31%, 95% CI: 28% – 34%, I ² : 64.0%
	Severe	9%, 95% CI: 5% – 14%, I ² : 99.3%	11%, 95% CI: 5% – 18%, I ² : 99.6%	16%, 95% CI: 11% – 23%, I ² : 91.4%	4%, 95% CI: 3% – 6%, I ² : 66.4%
	Overall	NA	27%, 95% CI: 22% – 32%	30%, 95% CI: 17% – 46%	NA
Region	South America	33%, 95% CI: 28% – 39%, I ² : 99.8%	33%, 95% CI: 27% – 39%, I ² : 99.8%	33%, 95% CI: 23% – 44%, I ² : 98.9%	33%, 95% CI: 18% – 51%, I ² : 99.7%
	Central America	21%, 95% CI: 17% – 25%, I ² : 94.3%	26%, 95% CI: 19% – 24%, I ² : 98.4%	NA	45%, 95% CI: 37% – 53%
	Countries speaking Spanish	28%, 95% CI: 21% – 36%, I ² : 99.7%	28%, 95% CI: 22% – 35%, I ² : 99.7%	33%, 95% CI: 23% – 45%, I ² : 98.8%	34%, 95% CI: 22% – 48%, I ² : 99.6%
	Countries speaking Portuguese	35%, 95% CI: 28% – 43%, I ² : 99.8%	36%, 95% CI: 28% – 45%, I ² : 99.8%	29%, 95% CI: 8% – 55%, I ² : 99.2%	NA
Instruments		GAD-7: 30%, 95% CI: 23% – 38%, I ² : 99.6%	PHQ-9: 31%, 95% CI: 24% – 38%, I ² : 99.6%	CPDI: 35%, 95% CI: 10% – 65%, I ² : 99.6%	ISI: 32%, 95% CI: 15% – 51%, I ² : 99.7%
		DASS-21: 29%, 95% CI: 20% – 39%, I ² : 99.1%	DASS-21: 34%, 95% CI: 21% – 47%, I ² : 99.9%	IES: 20%, 95% CI: 14% – 27%	DSM: 48%, 95% CI: 40% – 55%, I ² : 97.9%
		HADS: 39%, 95% CI: 3% – 85%, I ² : 99.1%	HADS: 20%, 95% CI: 7% – 38%, I ² : 99.7%	ISI-R: 43%, 95% CI: 11% – 78%	

Note: CI = Confidence Interval; I² statistic indicates the heterogeneity.

* I² is missing because the number of the effect size is less than 3 so that I² cannot be computed.

Credit author statement

SXZ: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data curation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Supervision.

KB: Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

TL: Investigation (Data).

RKD: Investigation (Data).

WX: Investigation (Data).

AY: Investigation (Data).

AD: Investigation (Data), Writing – review & editing.

BZC: Investigation (Data).

RZC: Investigation (Data).

SM: Investigation (Data).

XW: Investigation (Data).

JC: Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data curation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Supervision.

All authors reviewed and approved the manuscript. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

A conflict-of-interest statement

There are no conflicts of interest.

Transparency declaration

The corresponding author affirms this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported. No important aspects of the study have been omitted and any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

Ethical approval

Not applicable.

Funding

Jiyao Chen has received \$5000 research support from College of Business Oregon State University.

Patient and public involvement

No patient or public was involved in this systematic review and meta-analysis.

Availability of data

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, J.C., upon reasonable request.